98-84349-9

Dillon-Eagan, Francis

Lambert unmasked,
Rev. L.A. Lambert...

Washington, D.C.

1896

98-84349-9
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

332.41
Z
v.17

Dillon-Eagan, Francis.
Lambert unmasked ... his editorials on the crime of 1873 demonetizing silver reviewed and proved to be wilful falsehoods ... [New York? 1896?]
37 p. 23 cm.

Volume of pamphlets.

93795

Only Ed

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 11:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 2-27-98 INITIALS: PB

TRACKING # : 31544

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

P22.5
94
No. 11
LIBRARY OF
THE REFORM CLUB
SOUND CURRENCY COMMITTEE
52 William St., New York

PRICE TEN CENTS.

2 94
332.41
Z
L17
#11

LAMBERT UNMASKED.

REV. L. A. LAMBERT, LL. D., Editor-in-Chief of the "New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register."

His editorials on the Crime of 1873 demonetizing silver.

Reviewed and proved to be wilful falsehoods and vindictive libels on the living and the dead.

BY THE DISTINGUISHED LECTURER

FRANCIS DILLON-EAGAN.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second-class Matter.

Copyright, Washington, D. C.

1896 ?

READ THE FOLLOWING TESTIMONIALS.

"Francis Dillon-Eagan is an accomplished scholar, and he really has very remarkable and unusual oratorical power."—*Archbishop Ryan, Philadelphia.*

"Francis Dillon-Eagan is the most finished, scholarly and eloquent lecturer we have ever heard."—*St. Louis Daily Times.*

"Francis Dillon-Eagan is an able and eloquent lecturer. We bespeak for him a warm welcome wherever he goes. He deserves it for his patriotism; he will repay it by his ability."—*Boston Pilot.*

"Francis Dillon-Eagan's oratory is unmistakably Irish. It partakes of the passionate appeals of Grattan's eloquence and the elegant diction of Burke's classic periods."—*New Orleans Star.*

"STANDING ROOM ONLY," would have been an appropriate sign at the city hall ticket office long before 8 o'clock last evening. Perhaps never in its history was the hall so densely packed. Nor was the audience disappointed in its expectation of enjoyment. Francis Dillon-Eagan has not only never been surpassed in his line, but never has Holyoke seen his equal.—*Holyoke Democrat.*

"The verdict of all who heard Mr. Dillon-Eagan was: 'We must hear him again. It is also mine. This is saying much, for the audiences were very critical and not easy to please. The first night we had a perfect jam, and those who failed to gain admission to the large hall before the lecture began, could not even secure standing room. The second night all seats and standing room taken. This was beyond our expectations, as it was Wednesday night in Lent, when there were services in all the neighboring churches as well as in our own. At another period of the year I am convinced that we would have been obliged to have the lectures for four or five nights to accomodate those who wished to hear them."—*Extract from letter of Rev. C B. Sullivan, S. J., Detroit College.*

"The lecture Sunday evening by Francis Dillon-Eagan was listened to by an immense audience, the Grand Opera house being filled from gallery to stage. The distinguished lecturer is a very engaging speaker; every word he uttered bore with it something of fascination and conviction. His language was elegant and fit to express the beauties of his sentiment."—*Des Moines Daily News.*

"Francis Dillon-Eagan is a man gifted with the rarest mental endowments; he embodies the genius of the artist, the soul of the poet, the warm, the impetuous eloquence and classic diction of the finished and irrisistible orator who holds an audience quivering with emotions of suppressed enthusiasm, while with the deftness of an inspired genius, he awakens the soul's noblest susceptibilities by his winning and earnest appeals to the sentiment, the reason and judgment of his hearers."—*Northwestern Chronicle.*

The Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL. D., Editor-in-Chief of the "New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register" has, for several weeks, given editorial attention to the Coinage Act of 1873, and vigorously denounced it for having "surreptitiously obliterated the standard silver dollar from the document." Having some leisure time, I will review some of the Rev. Dr. Lambert's trenchant editorials, beginning with the first to which my attention was called, as follows:

"THE CRIME OF 1873."

The Rochester "Post-Express" is indignant at the use of the above phrase by the advocates of free silver to characterize the act of 1873, by which the silver dollar was demonetized. It says:

"How it can be considered a crime passes ordinary comprehension."

We propose to show that it comes within easy reach of ordinary intelligence. That crime was committed is beyond all reasonable doubt—a crime which should have landed its perpetrator or perpetrators in the penitentiary, if it could have been brought home to him or them at the time. This will appear in the course of our remarks on our esteemed contemporary's article.

The "Post-Express" says:

"It is said that the act was surreptitiously adopted. This is a downright falsehood. No act can be secretly adopted under the parliamentary rules that obtain in Congress. This act specially had a flood of sunlight thrown upon it. Submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, April 25, 1870, it was under the review of two Congresses, was printed, reported upon, amended, debated, referred to conference committees, whose reports were approved by the Senate and the House, and finally became a law on the 12th of February, 1873, nearly three years after it was proposed. It had large majorities in both houses, the vote in the lower house being 110 ayes and 13 nays, many of the affirmative votes being given by the very men —such of them as survive—who are now most clamorous in denouncing it."

We propose to refute the above statements by unimpeachable testimony, and show first, that the section of the bill demonetizing silver was surreptitiously altered after it left the hands of the Committee on Coinage and before it ultimately passed the House; second, that it passed the House in an unparliamentary manner, without being printed, read or discussed; third, that the members of Congress were deceived and led to believe that the bill provided for the standard silver dollar when in its ultimate passage it did not so provide. We now present our witnesses.

Judge Kelly of Pennsylvania was chairman of the committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures in 1872, when the bill originally passed the House. When charged with having advocated the demonetization of silver, he said on the floor of the House: "In connection with the charge that I advocated the bill which demonetized the standard silver dollar, I say that, though the chairman of the committee on Coinage, I was as ignorant of the fact that it would demonetize the silver dollar, or of its dropping the silver dollar from

our system of coins, as were those distinguished Senators, Messrs. Blaine and Voorhees, who were then members of the House, and each of whom a few days since, interrogated the other: 'Did you know it was dropped when the bill passed?' 'No,' said Mr. Blaine; 'did you?' 'No,' said Mr. Voorhees, 'I did not think there were three members in the House that knew it. I doubt whether Mr. Hooper, who, in my absence from the committee on Coinage, and attendance on the committee on Ways and Means, managed the bill, knew it. I say this in justice to him.'" (Congressional Record, vol. vii., part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1605.)

In the Forty-sixth Congress the same Judge Kelly threw an X-ray into the mystery when he said: "All I can say is that the committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, who reported the original bill, were faithful and able, and scanned its provisions closely; that as their organ I reported it; THAT IT CONTAINED PROVISIONS FOR BOTH THE STANDARD SILVER DOLLAR AND THE TRADE DOLLAR. Never having heard until a long time after its enactment into law of the substitution in the Senate of the section which dropped the standard silver dollar, I profess to know nothing of its history, but I am prepared to say that in the legislation of this country there is no mystery equal to the demonetization of the silver dollar of the United States. I have never met a man who could tell, just how it came about or why." (Congressional Record, vol. ix, part 1, Forty-sixth Congress, first session, page 1231.) Again Judge Kelly said: "It (the bill) was passed without any allusion in debate to the question of the retention or the abandonment of the standard silver dollar."

Here we have the chairman of the committee that prepared the bill declaring positively that it made provision for the standard silver dollar. Yet, after it passed, the standard dollar was found to be omitted! Now, the crime of 1873 was committed on that bill after it left the hands of the committee, and before it was voted on in the House.

Congressman Bright of Tennessee thus tells how it passed: "It passed by fraud in the House, never having been printed in advance, being a substitute for the printed bill; never having been read at the clerk's desk, the reading having been dispensed with by an impression that the bill made no alteration in the coinage laws; it was passed without discussion, debate being cut off by operation of the previous question. It was passed, to my certain information, under such circumstances that the fraud escaped the attention of some of the most watchful, as well as the ablest statesmen in Congress at the time. Aye, sir, it was a fraud that smells to heaven. It was a fraud that will stink in the nostrils of posterity, and for which some person must give account on the day of retribution." (Congressional Record, vol. vii, part 1, second session, Forty-fifth Congress, page 584.)

Senator Allison, late candidate for the Republican nomination, ought to be good authority for our Republican contemporary. Here is what he said in reference to the subject: "When the secret history of this bill of 1873 comes to be told, it will disclose the fact that the House of Representatives intended to coin both gold and silver, and intended to place both metals upon the French relation instead of on our own, which was the true scientific position with reference to this subject in 1873, but that the bill afterward was doctored, if I must use the term, and I use it in no offensive sense, of course"———

Mr. Sargent interrupted him and asked him what he meant by the word "doctored."

Mr. Allison said: "I said I used that word in no offensive sense. It was changed after discussion, and the dollar of 420 grains was substituted." (Congressional Record, vol. vii. part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1058.)

Senator Beck, in a speech in the Senate, said: "It (the demonetization bill) never was understood by either house of Congress. I say that with full knowledge of the facts. No newspaper reporter— and they are the most vigilant men I ever saw in obtaining information—discovered that it had been done." Congressional Record, vol. vii., part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 260.)

Senator Thurman said: " I cannot say what took place in the House, but I know when the bill was pending in the Senate, we thought it was simply a bill to reform the mint, regulate coinage and fix up one thing and another; and there is not a single man in the Senate, I think, unless a member of the committee from which the bill came, who had the slightest idea that it was even a squint toward demonetization."

Mr. Holman said in the House of Representatives: "I have before me the record of the proceedings of this House on the passage of that measure, a record which no man can read without being convinced that the measure and the methods of its passage through the House was a collosal swindle. I assert that the measure never had the sanction of this House, and it does not possess the moral force of law." (Congressional Record, vol. iv., part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, appendix, page 193.) Again on another occasion, he said: "The bill which finally passed the House and which ultimately became a law was certainly not read in the House."

Senator Hereford, discussing the subject in the Senate, said: "So that I say beyond the possibility of doubt (and there is no disputing it) that bill which demonetized silver, as it passed, never was read, never was discussed, and the chairman of the committee who reported it, who offered the substitute, said to Mr. Holman when inquired of, that it did not affect the coinage in any way whatever." (Congressional Record, vol. vii., part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 989.)

In view of this testimony the advocates of silver, and every one else who has a shred of moral sense left to him, are justified, nay, bound by the obligation of veracity to designate the law demonetizing silver as the "Crime of 1873," the, as yet, unpunished crime that has brought untold misfortune on the American people. The St. Louis convention has resolved to maintain that fraudulent law and perpetuate its evil results. The Chicago convention has resolved to blot it from the record and remove as far as possible the evil results it has produced.

According to the statement of Judge Kelly, given above, the silver bill, when it left the hands of the Committee on Coinage, did not demonetize the silver dollar. On the contrary, it made provisions for its continued coinage. After the bill was passed it was discovered that the provision for the silver dollar was omitted—had been surreptitiously obliterated from the document! Here we have the crime of '73. Who did this nefarious work? By whose request or suggestion was it that this doctored substitute for the original printed bill was not read in the House? Who shut off debate by a demand for the previous question?

To bring a crime home to its perpetrator, the first question asked is: Who benefited by it? The foreign and Wall Street bondholders made millions by it. This fact in itself is not enough to convict, but it affords a clue. With this clue in hand, we introduce Mr. Ernest Seyd into the conspiracy.

A writer, quoted by Samuel Leavitt in his book, "Our Money Wars," says:

"The English capitalists raised $500,000 and sent one Ernest Seyd to America to have silver demonetized. He came. In the bill was skilfully inserted a clause demonetizing silver. Before the bill passed a member of the committee which had the bill in charge stated that 'Ernest Seyd of London, a distinguished writer and bullionist, who is now here, has given great attention to the subject of mint coinage. After having examined the first draft of this bill he has made various sensible suggestions, which the committee adopted and embodied in the bill.'—(Congressional Record, April 9, 1872.)"

As Ernest Seyd is an interesting and important character in this conspiracy, we will follow him to London and see what he has to say about his missionary work in America.

In 1892 Frederick A. Luckenbach, a former member of the New York Stock Exchange made an affidavit in which the following statements occur:

'In 1865 I visited London, England, for the purpose of placing there Pennsylvania oil properties in which I was interested. I took with me letters of introduction to many gentlemen in London, among them one to Mr. Ernest Seyd, from Robert M. Faust, ex-treasurer of Philadelphia. I became well acquainted with Mr. Seyd and with his brother, Richard Seyd, who, I understand, is yet living. I visited London thereafter every year, and with each visit renewed my acquaintance with Mr. Seyd. In February, 1874, while on one of these visits, and while his guest at dinner, I, among other things, alluded to rumors afloat of Parliamentary corruption, and expressed astonishment that such corruption should exist. In reply to this he told me he could relate facts about the corruption of the American Congress that would place it far ahead of the English Parliament in that line. After dinner he invited me into another room, where he resumed the conversation about legislative corruption. He said: 'If you will pledge me your honor as a gentleman not to divulge what I am about to tell you while I live, I will convince you that what I said about the corruption of the American Congress is true.' I gave him my promise, and he then continued: 'I went to America in 1872-3, authorized to secure, if I could, the passage of a bill demonetizing silver. It was to the interest of those whom I represented—the governors of the Bank of England—to have it done. I took with me $500,000, with instructions that if that was not sufficient to accomplish the object, to draw for another $500,000, or as much more as was necessary. I saw the committees of the House and Senate and paid the money, and stayed in America until I knew the measure was safe. Your people will not now comprehend the far-reaching extent of that measure, but they will in after years. Whatever you may think of corruption in the English Parliament, I assure you I would not have dared to make such an attempt here as I did in your country.'

Such is Ernest Seyd's confession; such the history of the "Crime of 1873;" such the way in which the standard dollar was dropped from our coinage.

Strange and incredible as it may seem, the platform of the St. Louis convention maintains as a party principal that the law thus passed by the intrigue of English capitalists must not be abolished without the consent of those same conspirators against the welfare of the American people! Our national honor, we are told, requires that we must continue indefinitely to suffer the evil results of that criminal conspiracy. Every effort to free ourselves from the iniquitous burden is called repudiation. In view of these things, it is not difficult to understand the intense earnestness and enthusiasm of the common people at the Chicago convention and the brusque manner in which they treated the professional politicians, the political hacks, the pliant tools of the organized and conspiring wealth that caused the evils of which the laboring people are the victims.

I read this article from your pen with amazement. Having known you by reputation for more than twenty years as a faithful priest, an able journalist and a distinguished scholar. "Lambert's Notes on Ingersoll" I have read repeatedly, and have always afforded me mental pabulum because you demolished the fallacies and sophistries of the fascinating orator, but blasphemous infidel, by your intellectual acumen and irresistible logic that but few men inherit.

I never had any knowledge of your political principles before I was informed about your editorial on 'The Crime of 1873.' Had I been asked on which side does Father Lambert stand? I would have promptly answered on the only side that honest men, who are not deluded, can stand—the Gold standard of value. Glancing again at the editorial page of the "Freeman's Journal" I found a few sentences, explaining your political affiliations, which read as follows:

"Our first vote was for Stephen A. Douglas, and from that time we continued voting for the Democratic candidates, including Tilden and Hancock. Our next vote was for James G. Blaine in 1884.

Taking the present administration as a fair exponent of Democracy, we had hoped to vote for McKinley, but the gilded politicians of the St. Louis convention have barred us out with their gold platform and their greater interests in foreign nations than in their own. The Chicago convention taught us that the present administration is not an exponent of Democracy; that true Democracy means bimetallism, and a return to the monetary system established by the founders of the Republic in 1792. We must, consequently, cast loose from our former moorings."

"TEMPORE MUTANTUR, ET NOS MUTAMER IN ILLIS" —"The times change and we change with them."

Continuing my reading of your editorials I saw a short paragraph in which you say:

"Calling names indicates weakness. If the gold advocates are convinced that they are championing a just cause, let them by all means abandon billingsgate and give us arguments and not epithets."

Immediately following this excellent advice, your very next sentence says:

"A correspondent sends us a clipping from the "Rochester Union and Advertiser" in which the sapient moral leper expert and theological figurehead of that Democratic journal criticises the Chicago platform. Our correspondent asks us to expose a tricky sophism used by the expert, and which has been floating about in the gold trust press for some time. The sophism consists in saying in reference to the demonetization of silver that only eight millions of silver dollars were coined between 1793 and 1873. The

statement, when speaking of currency, is misleading, for it leaves the false impression that that amount of silver was all that was coined in those years."

It seems to me that you, Rev. Doctor, have forgotten the definition of the word "billingsgate." And wherein does the Rev. Editor of the "Rochester Union" lay himself open to the charge of "a tricky sophism?" You answer:

"The sophism consists in saying that only 8,000,000 of silver dollars were coined between 1793 and 1873."

I fail to find any sophism in that statement. The editor was speaking in round figures, and not in fractional parts of millions. To be absolutely correct he should have said 8,031,238 of silver dollars. But you contend "the statement is misleading because the gentleman did not speak of dimes. The question at issue is not about fractional currency but dollars. In all that you have written on the free coinage of silver you have not said a word about dimes because you advocate dollars, and not only dollars which might contain more or less silver, but standard dollars weighing 412½ grains. In your journal of August 15, 1896, I read a statement of the coinage of silver dollars up to 1873. The figures are so outrageously wrong that I imagined the scissors—editor of the "Freeman" must have been doing multiplication. I have waited several weeks for a correction, but in vain. You, Mr. Editor-in-Chief, gave to your readers the following figures:

"Up to 1873, 800,000,000 silver dollars had been coined. In 1871, 1,115,-700 of these dollars were coined. In 1872, 1,106,450 were coined, and from Jan. 1, 1873, to Feb. 12, 1873, the date of the demonetization act—a period of six weeks—293,600 were coined. Thus the mints from Jan. 1, '73, up to that fatal Feb. 12, '73, were coining silver dollars at the rate of 2,500,000 for that year."

If the theological head of the "Rochester Union" is guilty of "tricky sophism," what is the theological head of the New York "Freeman's Journal" guilty of? Exaggerations resulting from an acute attack of silver lunacy that requires an immediate application of the gold cure.

Your alleged crime of 1873, as asserted in your indictment, is

"That the bill made provision for that standard silver dollar After the bill was passed it was discovered that the provision for the (standard) silver dollar was omitted—had been surreptitiously obliterated from the document."

You specifically charge,

"First, that the section of the bill demonetizing silver was surreptitiously altered after it left the hands of the Committee on Coinage, and before it ultimately passed the House; second, that it passed the House in an unparliamentary manner, without being printed, read or discussed; third, that the members of Congress were deceived and led to believe that the bill provided for the standard silver dollar when in its ultimate passage it did not so provide. Here we have the crime of '73; who did this nefarious work, which should have landed its perpetrator in the penitentiary?"

Rev. Doctor, you not only play the part of prosecuting attorney in this alleged crime, but you assume the character of judge, and sentence the supposed perpetrator of the crime to the penitentiary, reminding me of one of the actors in the comic opera known as "The Mikado," who

struts upon the stage and pompously exclaims "I am the lord high executioner."

After producing your **exparte** evidence, which you call "unimpeachable testimony," you say:

"To bring a crime home to its perpetrator, the first question asked is: Who benefited by it? The foreign and Wall street bondholders made millions by it. This fact in itself is not enough to convict, but it affords a clue. With this clue in hand, we introduce Mr. Ernest Seyd into the conspiracy. A writer quoted by Samuel Leavitt in his book "Our Money Wars," says:

"The English capitalists raised $500,000 and sent one Ernest Seyd to America to have silver demonetized. He came. In the bill was skilfully inserted a clause demonetizing silver. Before the bill passed a member of the committee which had the bill in charge stated that 'Ernest Seyd, of London, a distinguished writer and bullionist, who is now here, has given great attention to the subject of mint coinage. After having examined the first draft of this bill he has made various sensible suggestions, which the committee adopted and embodied 'n the bill.'" (Congressional Record, April 9, 1872.)

In introducing "Mr. Ernest Seyd into the conspiracy," where do you get your "umimpeachable testimony?" From a writer quoted by another writer, neither of whom knew even the name of the paper that contains the proceedings of Congress on April 9th, 1872, at which date the Congressional Record had not been born. Mr. Leavitt's quotation contains a fraudulent falsehood, and if you will seek further information from the writer whom you quote you will learn, Rev. Doctor, that there is "a woman in the case," who has not the slightest regard for the truth. The member of the committee which had the bill in charge when considered in the House on April 9th, 1872, was Mr. Hooper, of Massachusetts, who, in a carefully prepared speech of ten columns of the "Congressional Globe," explained the bill section by section. Mr. Hooper says: "The bill under consideration is believed to contain all that is valuable in existing laws, with such new provisions added as appear necessary to those best acquainted with the subject. The bill was prepared two years ago, and has been submitted to careful and deliberate examination. It has the approval by nearly all the mint experts of the country, and the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Ernest Seyd, of London, a distinguished writer, who has given great attention to the subject of mints and coinage, after examining the first draft of the bill furnished many valuable suggestions which have been incorporated in the bill."

Compare this quotation from Mr. Hooper's speech, especially the sentence in italics, with the quotation from the "unknown writer," as given to the thousands who read and believe as gospel truth all that appears on the editorial page of the New York "Freeman's Journal," because of their unbounded confidence in its Editor-in-Chief—Rev. L. A. Lambert LL. D.

Notice, sir, that the interpolation "who is now here" is convincing proof of a forgery. Senator Hoar called the attention of the Senate to this interpolation when it first appeared in the newspapers and said: "Mr. President, the words 'who is now here' incorporated into this pretended quotation in that newspaper paragraph are a deliberate, vile, audacious, unscrupulous, insolent and infamous forgery."

Rev. Editor-in-Chief, you again inform your readers by saying:

"As Ernest Seyd is an interesting and important character in this conspiracy, we will follow him to London and see what he has to say about his missionary work in America.

"In 1892 Frederick A. Luckenbach, a former member of the New York Stock Exchange, made an affadivit:"

In which he says: "that in February, 1874, he was the guest at dinner of Mr. Ernest Seyd, who after dinner invited him into an other room, where Mr. Seyd said: 'I went to America in 1872-73, authorized to secure, if I could, the passage of a bill demonetizing silver. It was to the interest of those whom I represented, the governors of the Bank of England, to have it done. I took with me $500,000 with instructions if that was not sufficient to accomplish the object to draw for another $500,000, or as much more as was necessary. I saw the committees of the House and Senate and paid the money, and stayed in America until I knew the measure was safe.'

You comment on this statement and say:

"Such is Ernest Seyd's confession, and such the history of the crime of 1873, such the way the standard dollar was dropped from our coinage."

Such is Ernest Seyd's confession? No, sir; emphatically no. It is no more Ernest Seyd's confession than it is Louis Lambert's confession. Who is Luckenbach? You, sir, say "a former member of the New York Stock Exchange." Not true, sir. I made inquiry through the well-known house of Prince & Whitely. Two of its firm, who have been members of the New York Stock Exchange for more than thirty years, assured me that Frederick A. Luckenbach was never a member of the New York Stock Exchange. I have traced this man, Luckenbach, to Denver, Colorado, where his perjured affidavit was first published, and it is shown clearly by his own statement to be a perjury.

In 1892 the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, who is an able advocate of bimetallism, was interviewed by a reporter of the Dublin "Freeman's Journal." This interview has attracted the attention of two nations, and an American edition has been published by the free coinage of silver party, and is to-day widely circulated by silverites, because they consider it favors their views. In this pamphlet, which I assume you, Reverend Doctor, are familiar, you will find, on page 76, what the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh says about Mr. Ernest Seyd. The Archbishop of Dublin, speaking of the results of monometallism as compared with bimetallism, says:

"The classic prediction in this matter is that of the French economist, Mr. Ernest Seyd. So far back as 1871, two years before the calamitous success of the doctrinaire crusade against the maintenance of the bimetallist system as it was then in operation in France, Mr. Seyd used the following remarkable words: 'It is a great mistake to suppose that the adoption of the gold standard of value by other States besides England will be beneficial. It will only lead to the destruction of the monetary equilibrium hitherto existing, and a fall in the value of silver from which England's trade and the Indian silver valuations will suffer more than all other interests, grievous as the general decline of prosperity all over the world will be.'"

Mr. Seyd's connection with the Act of 1873 was stated by Mr. Hooper, from whose speech I have already quoted. He was one of the eminent specialists to whom the printed bill was sent for criticism and suggestions. Like the others, Mr. Seyd returned his views in writing. His letter covers nine columns of the "Congressional Record." Section 15 of the bill, that providing for the silver coinage, received from him especial attention. The opening sentence of his letter, together with an extract of his discussion of Section 15, will indicate the spirit in which he considered the matter:

La Princess Street, London, February 17, 1872.

"Dear Sir—You were kind enough to forward to Mr. Alfred Latham a copy of your coinage bill for the United States, to be sent to me, and you expressed a wish to receive criticisms on its provisions.

* * * * * * * *

"Sec. 15. I now come to the most important part of the bill, that of the valuation which, according to section 15, omits the coinage of the silver dollar, and confirms the debased silver coinage of half-dollars and below, under the tender limit of $5. I am aware, of course, that through the amendment of 1853 the same debased coinage was already established; but although the actual coinage of the silver dollar had practically ceased, still that piece was not abolished by law. As this new bill presumably repeals all previous enactments, I suppose that the total abolition of the silver dollar is contemplated. * * *

"Permit me to beg that you will first investigate the question of double vs. single valuation. * * *

"Apart from the theory, why should America have given up her silver dollar? The cause of its disappearance from circulation is due to the original error of there being too much silver in the piece. * * * That cause would have been removed if the dollar weighed 400 grains, that being the true proportion of 1 to 15½ gold to silver, instead of 412½ grains, as by the old law. Why should it not be reintroduced at its true full weight of 400 grains and become again one of the active agents of commerce? * * *

"I am, dear sir, yours very obediently,

ERNEST SEYD."

"To Samuel Hooper, Esq., M. C."

These brief extracts are sufficient to indicate Mr. Seyd's attitude toward silver, and the manly, dignified way in which he presented his argument.

The New York "Sun" of Thursday, September 21st, 1893, published the following:

"One of the most conspicuous lies reiterated by the partisans of free silver coinage is that the dropping of the silver dollar from the list of United States coins in the coinage act of 1873 was procured by bribing members

of Congress. It is asserted that the money to the amount of $500,000 was furnished by European money lenders, and that Mr. Ernest Seyd, now deceased, was their agent at Washington. The falsity of this assertion has been thoroughly exposed during the present session of Congress, by Senator Hoar and Senator Sherman, and as a finishing touch to their work we are able to print the following letter from the late Mr. Seyd's son:

'Sir.—Statements have been circulated for some time past in the press of the United States that the late Mr. Ernest Seyd went to Washington in 1872 at the instance of a powerful clique of financiers with £100,000 in order to bribe members of Congress to vote for the demonetization of silver. I trust you will allow me to assure you the story is an entire fabrication, Mr. Seyd never having been in the States since 1856. The absurdity of this myth is the more apparent as my father had always been an ardent champion of silver, and was the first to take up the silver cause in England against the prevailing doctrinism here, as his numerous works on the subject will show. The following extracts are interesting, and occur in the "Decline of Property," 1878, pages 15 and 22: 'In the United States a kind of bimetallism is now being attempted. Unsuppported by other nations, exposed to the play of hostile factions, this attempt will turn out a failure. In the United States the silver dollar has again been introduced, but it is quite evident that their bimetallism cannot be maintained without much more effective support.'

Surely, sir, the silver party in the States are not well advised in spreading these baseless rumors and sacrificing one of their best friends.

I remain, yours truly,
ERNEST SEYD,
38 Lombard street, London, E. C.'

It is perhaps too much to expect that this letter will put an end to the circulation of the story referred to, but it affords additional authority, if any were needed, for denouncing it as a falsehood."

When your contemporary, the Rochester "Post-Express," tried to enlighten you by saying that "you hardly alluded to the history of the act through the various stages of introduction, debate and passage," you replied to your brother editor by remarking:

"We had no occasion to consider any stage of the act but that particular one wherein the crime was committed."

By stating that wherein the crime was committed. How did you consider this particular one?

"The crime of 1873 was committed on that bill after it had left the hands of the committee and before it was voted on in the House."

This assertion is a downright falsehood. On January the 9th, 1872, Mr. Kelley, chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, said:

"The Senate took up the bill and acted upon it during the last Congress, and sent it to the House; it was referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, and received as careful attention as I have known a committee to bestow upon any measure."

This bill, reported by Mr. Kelley, was debated and recommitted several times, and was in the hands of the Committee on Coinage until it passed the House, by a vote of 110 yeas and 13 nays, on May 27th, 1872. Your specification of the time wherein the crime was committed has not the existence of one-sixtieth part of

a minute. Who committed the Crime of 1873? Who,—Echo answers, Who?. When, again, the editor of the Rochester "Post-Express" tries to lead you into the way of truth and honesty by telling you that "there is not a scintilla of evidence that the dropping of the silver dollar from the coinage was surreptitiously done," you assert another palpable falsehood by saying:

"The question is not about the three-year old original bill which was not passed, but about the unprinted, unread, undiscussed bill which did pass so mysteriously, so silent, like the tread of a cat."

As Editor-in-Chief of a great Catholic journal, it seems strange that you have forgotten the use of inverted commas. Where did you find that "cat"? The stealing of a pretty pussy may be only a pecadillo, but you had no right to mar the rhetorical figure of a cat that belonged to Senator Daniel. I am quite certain you attended "Coin's Financial School," which opened on the 7th of May, 1894, and where "journalists predominated." I find that at the first session the learned professor, descanting on the Crime of 1873, says:

"When Congress passed an act that repealed the clause in the law of 1792, which had the silver dollar as the unit of value prior to 1873, and substituted a law in the following language:"

"That the gold coins of the United States shall be a one dollar piece, which at the standard weight of twenty-five and eight-tenths grains shall be the unit of value."

This learned Professor Coin revealed something "new under the sun," when he informed his large audience "that the gold coins of the United States shall be a one-dollar piece." What has become of our great American golden eagle?. The professor, continuing his interesting instruction, says:

"It was when specie payments were about to be resumed that the country appeared to realize what had been done. The newspapers on the morning of February 13, 1873, and at no time in the vicinity of that period, had any account of the change. In the language of Senator Daniel, of Virginia, 'it seems to have gone through Congress like the silent tread of a cat.'"

Again, Mr. Editor-in-Chief, the "Post-Express" informs you that, "To call the coinage act of '73 a crime is to indict Congress and the Executive for the orderly discharge of the functions constitutionally reposed in them." You answer this gentle reproof by saying:

"To call the demonetization of silver a crime is to indict those who surreptitiously inserted the clause in the act which produced that effect. Neither Congress nor the President was a party to this surreptitious insertion. They, like the people, were the victims of it."

This statement puts you in a dilemma from which there is no escape. Having involved yourself within a circle of falsehood, charging that Congress was bribed by Mr. Ernest Seyd with $500,000 to demonetize silver, you are now trying to solve the old mathematical problem of squaring the circle.

You assail your brother editor again in your vigorous style—

"The attempt of the 'Post-Express'' to impeach the testimony of Senators Allison, Thurman and Beck and Representatives Bright, Holman, Cannon and Kelly will not weaken the effect of the positive and emphatic asseverations of these well-known men. To imply that they would lie their way out of responsibility for the act of '73 is too strong a draft on credulity. If the bill was all right and passed in an open and orderly manner, as is asserted, why should these Senators and Representatives charge fraud? They were not content with saying they did not understand the terms of the act. Senator Allison understood the terms and put the case clearly when he said it was 'doctored, changed after discussion.' It is this 'doctoring,' this change after discussion, that constitutes the crime of '73. Senator Allison stands high in the Republican party at present, and it is an unkind cut for a Republican organ to throw a cloud over his veracity, and imply that he could conveniently forget when the wish is father to the thought."

Reverend Doctor, I will impeach the testimony of all your witnesses, except Senator Allison, and further more I will impeach you, Louis A. Lambert, with having garbled the language of Senators Allison and Sargent in their "passage-at-arms" on the floor of the Senate during the second session of the Forty-fifth Congress.

I have already produced your editorial on "The Crime of 1873," but to show your witness, Senator Allison, in his true light, I shall reproduce his testimony on the alleged crime. Your statement reads as follows:

"Senator Allison, late candidate for the Republican nomination, ought to be good authority. Here is what he said in reference to the subject: 'When the secret history of this bill of 1873 comes to be told, it will disclose the fact that the House of Representatives intended to coin both gold and silver, and intended to place both metals upon the French relation instead of on our own, which was the true scientific position with reference to this subject in 1873, but that the bill afterward was doctored, if I must use the term, and I use it in no offensive sense, of course'——

Mr. Sargent interrupted him and asked him what he meant by the word "doctored."

"Mr. Allison said: 'I said I used the word in no offensive sense. It was changed after discussion, and the dollar of 420 grains was substituted.' "

In your editorial of August 15th, '96, from which I have quoted, you wilfully, if not maliciously, place Senator Allison in a false position. You say,

"Senator Allison understood the the terms and put the case clearly when he said it was 'doctored,' changed after discussion. It is this 'doctoring,' this change after discussion, that constitutes the Crime of '73."

I deny your conclusion. I will not allow you to wander from Dan to Beersheba. I shall hold you to your indictment, which "charges that the standard silver dollar was obliterated from the document before the bill passed the House." Therefore, how could a bill be "doctored" or tampered with by changing before discussion or after discussion in the Senate what was not in the document? Besides, in your editorial of August the 15th, you conveniently forget a very important qualification which Senator Allison expressed as to the word "doctored." He said:

"If I must use the term, I use it in no offensive sense, of course." You, Reverend Sir, use the term in its most offensive sense, and thus pervert the meaning of Senator Allison.

You say, "Mr. Sargent interrupted him and asked what he meant by the word 'doctored'." Why did you not quote the whole of Senator Sargent's interruption? It would not have required more than a few lines in your editorial. Why did you garble Senator Allison's reply to Senator Sargent? For the sufficient reason that it would have injured your case. Here is another evidence of your dishonesty, and proves clearly how you have fallen from the highest vocation on earth—the sublime dignity of a Catholic priest—to become the prejudiced partisan of a political popocrat who is masquerading under the honored name of Democracy. But what did Senator Sargent say when he interrupted Senator Allison? He said:

"What does the Senator from Iowa mean by the word 'doctored?' It (the bill if '73) was amended in the Senate and went to a Committee of Conference, if that is 'doctored,' and the report of the Committee of Conference was concurred in by both Houses, I should like to know if the word 'doctored' applies to our legislation here where there has been three or four days debate."

Mr. Allison replied

"I said I used the word in no offensive sense. It was changed after discussion, and the dollar of 420 grains was substituted for it. I have here, if the Senator from California doubts what I say the report of Mr. Ruggles to the Chamber of Commerce of the city of New York, showing that it was the original intention of the promoters of the bill of 1873 that both silver and gold should be coined, and that they should be placed upon the French ratio. He says: 'The bill, as introduced, proposed to reduce the weight of the silver dollar from 412½ grains to 384 grains.' The Chamber of Commerce of New York on examining and considering that provision, by resolution duly transmitted to Congress, respectfully recommending that the weight of the silver dollar should be made precisely equivalent to that of the five-franc silver coin of Europe."

Mr. Sargent said:

"I am not doubting the Senator's facts, I was simply objecting to his epithet."

I have here produced the connected extracts from the remarks of Senators Allison and Sargent, made during the debate in the Senate, February 15th, 1878.

Why the Editor-in-chief of the "Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register" should have called Senator Allison as a witness to prove that the standard silver dollar was surreptitiously obliterated from the document known as the Coinage Act of 1873, is a mystery that can never be revealed. The unimpeachable testimony of the distinguished Senator proves conclusively that the alleged crime of 1873 was never committed. Even a single sentence expressed in the mutilated extract that appeared in the "Freeman's Journal" proves the opposite of what Mr.

Lambert wanted the readers of his journal to believe. Senator Allison said: "When the secret history of this bill of 1873 comes to be told it will disclose the fact that the House of Representatives intended to coin both gold and silver, and intended to place both metals upon the French relation, instead of our own, which was the true scientific position with reference to this subject in 1873."

You, sir, say in your editorial that "Mr. Kelly was chairman of the committee that prepared the bill." You might as truthfully have said Mr. Kelley was chairman of the committee that prepared the Declaration of Independence. Your assumed ignorance of the voluminous debates during the three years' of discussion by the members of Congress on this bill that finally passed both Houses by a very large majority and became a law by the approval of the President, April 12th, 1873, is to me simply astounding. I could not have believed it possible that the Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL. D., would write upon a subject of which he seemingly had no knowledge. When in past years you discussed theological subjects, you knew what you were doing. When you demolished the infidel Ingersoll you gained a national reputation; and, what is more important, you must have gained the deep affection and apostolic blessing of the venerable Bishop of Rochester, in whose diocese you have labored for more than a quarter of a century as a zealous and pious priest. But when I read your editorial on "The Crime of 1873," I was painfully compelled to change my mind as to your character. The manifest motive that actuated the writing of your editorials that have appeared in the "Freeman's Journal" for several weeks has been to delude the millions of Catholics in the United States so that they would give their votes for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of sixteen ounces of silver for one ounce of gold, when the commercial rate is thirty-one ounces of silver to one ounce of gold—a financial heresy that has not its counterpart in the history of the world. In your untiring efforts to pursuade the Catholics who read your journal to cast their votes for the man who, if elected President on the 3d of next November, has vowed to adopt and put in force this financial heresy, you are guilty of a crime that requires immediate reparation. I know that you are familiar with the Decalogue which was written on Mount Sinai by Moses, the great lawgiver of Israel. It seems to me that you, Reverend Doctor, have "surreptitiously obliterated from that document" the commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." To my certain knowledge you have been violating that divine decree for the last two months, by giving publication to falsehoods, by garbling and perverting the language of honorable men, and by libeling the living and the dead.

As you are apparently ignorant as to who prepared the bill that became the Act of 1873, the following letter will furnish the required knowledge:

Treasury Department, April 25, 1870.

Sir.—I have the honor to transmit herewith "a bill revising the laws relative to the mint, assay offices, and coinage of the United States," and accompanying report. The bill has been prepared under the supervision of John Jay Knox, Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and its passage in recommended in the form presented. It includes, in a condensed form, all the important legislation upon the coinage, not now obsolete, since the first mint was established, in 1792; and the report gives a concise statement of the various amendments proposed to existing laws, and the necessity for the change recommended. There has been no revision of the laws pertaining to the mint and coinage since 1837, and it is believed that the passage of the inclosed bill will conduce greatly to the efficiency and economy of this important branch of the Government service.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

George S. Boutwell,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. John Sherman,
Chairman Finance Committee,
Senate of the United States.

In your ponderous editorial of August the 15th, 1896, you forcibly answer some mild questions put to you by the editor of the Rochester "Post-Express." You say:

"The 'Post-Express' wonders again that we trusted to the memory of the Senators and Gongressmen whose testimony were introduced. If we reject testimony resting on the memory of living witnesses we may as well close our courts, for the basis of most of their decisions is the memory of living witnesses. It must be a poor case, indeed, whose defense requires the rejection of one of the principal criteria of certitude as to facts."

I must give you credit for your ability as a special pleader. Suppose your living witnesses are proved to be lying, on whose testimony shall we close our courts? If your witness commits perjury, is that one of the "principal criteria of certitude as to facts"? I have already proved that your witness, Luckenbach, is a perjured scoundrel. I have cleared the name of Ernest Seyd from your vindictive libel. Don't dare to shield yourself with the lame excuse that you found Luckenbach's affidavit in a newspaper. Your "Moral Theology" teaches you that repeating a slander or a libel is equally as slanderous or libelous as the original matter. I shall now investigate the "unimpeachable testimony of your "living witness," Mr. Kelley, who, I regret to say is dead.

Your editorial on "The Crime of 1873" says:

"In the Forty-sixth Congress Judge Kelly threw an X ray into the mystery when he said: 'All I can say is that the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, who reported the original bill, were faithful and able, and scanned its provisions closely; that as their organ I reported it; THAT IT CONTAINED PROVISIONS FOR BOTH THE STANDARD SILVER DOLLAR

AND THE TRADE DOLLAR. Never having heard for a long time after its enactment into law of the substitution in the Senate of the section which dropped the standard silver dollar."

I shall appeal from "Philip drunk to Philip sober," and throw some X rays on your witness, Kelley. The bill that he reported, after it had then been printed four times, passed the Senate, January 10th, 1871. The silver legislation in this bill is known as Section 15, and was as follows:

"Sec. 15. And be it further enacted, that of the silver coins, the weight of the half dollar shall be 192 grains; and the quarter dollar and dime shall be respectively one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar. That the silver coin issued in conformity with the above section shall be a legal tender in any one payment of debts for all sums less than $1."

Can you, Mr. Editor-in-Chief, find the standard silver dollar in the bill that passed the Senate January 10th, 1871? No, sir! It was even then "surreptitiously obliterated from the document."

The Senate bill was ordered printed by the House January 13th, 1871. The bill reported with substitute, and recommitted February 15th, 1871; was reported from the House Committee on Coinage and introduced, to the Forty-second Congress, first session, January 9th, 1872, by Mr. Kelley, chairman of the committee, who said that "the bill received as careful attention as I have ever known the committee to bestow on any measure." How did the silver section then read? Here it is—

"Sec. 15. And be it further enacted, That of the silver coins the weight of the half-dollar, or piece of 50 cents, shall be 192 grains; and the quarter-dollar and dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; which coin shall be a legal tender, at their denominational value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

The bill was recommitted, and never again reported by Mr. Kelley, who tells you "that Mr. Hooper, of Massachusetts, had charge of the bill during his absence from the Committe on Coinage, and attendance on the Committee on Ways and Means." The bill was amended, printed and reported, February 13th, 1872, by Mr. Hooper. Debated April 9th, 1872. Amended and passed the House May 27th, 1872. Where can you, Mr. Lambert, find in Section 15 of the bill that Mr. Kelley reported provisions for the standard silver dollar and the trade dollar? What change did the committee of the House, as reported by Mr. Kelley, make in Section 15 of the bill as passed by the Senate? They raised the limit of fractional silver coins from $1 to $5 in any one payment

How, I ask you, could Mr. Kelley state that the bill which he reported contained provisions for both the standard silver dollar and the trade dollar, when it did not contain provision for any kind of a dollar? You printed Mr. Kelley's statement, made, not in 1872, but in 1878, in capital letters to emphasize his falsehood. Thus far, from April 25th, 1870, to January 9th, 1872, the standard silver dollar has been "surreptitiously obliterated from the document."

On February 13th, 1872, the bill, which Mr. Kelley had recommitted

was reported to the House by Mr. Hooper, of Massachusetts, who, in the absence of Mr. Kelley had charge of the bill. The amended section on silver reads thus:

"Sec. 16. And be it further enacted, That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, half-dollar or fifty cent piece, a quarter dollar or twenty-five cent piece, and a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains; the half-dollar, quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coin shall be a legal tender, at their denominational value, for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

Mark, sir, the silver dollar enacted is not the standard dollar of 412½ grains. On April 9th, 1872, this bill came up in the House for consideration. Mr. Hooper, in a carefully prepared speech, from which I have already quoted, explained the bill, section by section. Discussing the silver coins, he said:

"Sec. 15 re-enacts the provisions of the existing laws defining the silver coins and their weights, respectively, EXCEPT IN RELATION TO THE SILVER DOLLAR, which is reduced in weight from 412½ to 384 grains, thus making it a subsidiary coin in harmony with the silver coins of less denomination to secure its concurrent circulation with them. The silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value being greater than its nominal value, long ceased to be a coin of circulation, and is melted by manufacturers of silver ware. It does not circulate now in commercial transactions with any country, and the convenience of these manufacturers in this respect can better be met by supplying small stamped bars of the same standard, avoiding the useless expense of coining the dollar for that purpose."

On the same day Mr. Stoughton, Representative from Michigan, made a speech of several columns of the "Congressional Globe," in which he said:

"The silver coins provided for are the dollar, 384 grains troy, the half-dollar, quarter dollar, and dime, of the value and weight of one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the dollar, respectively; and they are made a legal tender for all sums not exceeding $5 at any one payment. The silver dollar, as now issued, is worth for bullion 3¼ cents more than the gold dollar, and 7¼ cents more than two half dollars; having a greater intrinsic and nominal value it is certain to be withdrawn from circulation whenever we return to specie payments, and to be used for only manufacture and exportation as bullion. The history of the silver dollar is somewhat remarkable."

He then read an article from the "American Cyclopedia," which furnishes an explanation of the confusion the silver dollar has caused in our metal currency, and then Mr. Stoughton says:

"Much of this difficulty has arisen from the impracticable attempt to make the silver coins conform absolutely and intrinsically to the gold standard. The office of the silver or subsidiary coins is to supply the public want for small change. They are made the tokens of value. NOT THE VALUE ITSELF, and are designed only for exchange and circulation at home, up to, but never in excess of the requirements of trade. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to say that the rapid reduction of our national debt, and

the increased confidence in our public securities, clearly indicate that the time is approaching when the honest ring of solid coin will again be heard in the busy marts of trade and commerce, and that it is the imperative duty of Congress to shape our coinage system to the growing wants of the immediate future."

MR. KELLEY—Mr. Speaker: In the course of my Congressional career, now becoming somewhat extended, I have had frequent occasions to notice that any legislation, however general in its character, which assails existing abuses and would abolish opportunities for illegitimate profits to speculators, is met with zealous and seemingly organized opposition. It was apparent to me when I had the honor of bringing this bill to the attention of the House the other day that those who have an interest in securing its defeat, which now amounts to at least from a quarter to a half million dollars a year, and which would, if we were on the basis of specie payments, have an interest running up into many millions, had ingeniously plied some of the leading members of the House with suggestions touching the minor details of the bill, which, if accepted by the House, might render its passage impossible. I, therefore, asked its recommittment to the committee. Let me, Mr. Speaker, hastily point out some of the interests that are on this floor seeking to protect themselves by preventing the passage of this bill. One silver bullion dealer, of New York, during the last Congress admitted to the gentleman (Mr. Hooper) who is now acting as chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, that under 'one defect in existing laws' he was making, at the cost of the Government, from seventy-five thousand to one hundred thousand dollars a year. Is it any wonder that a man who has such large profits dependent upon the continuance of the existing system should be able to furnish gentlemen with ingenious arguments about subsidary coinage? His profits—and he is but one of those that are growing fat and greedy upon the defects of our mint laws—arise in this way: Our country, like every other civilized government, should procure its own metal out of which to make subsidary coinage. Now, sir, every coin of ours that is not gold is subsidary. As gentlemen seem to express surprise at this proposition, I repeat the silver coin is subsidary. All other Governments pay the expense of minting by the differnce between the intrinsic value of subsidary coins and the value at which they circulate, and at which the Government redeems them. And such was the law of this country, until, by a ruling of Mr. Guthrie, when he was Secretary of the Treasury, the mint was ordered to receive silver from private individuals and coin it. Now, it so happens that a constituent of the gentleman from New York has been taking advantage of that ruling, and deposited silver to be made into half dollars and other silver coins. He has, as he stated to my colleague (Mr. Hooper of Massachusetts), and myself, been doing a business of from eighteen hundred thousand to two million dollars per annum, giving him as profit an annual income equal to the salary of the President for the presidential term. Is it to be wondered at that that gentleman should suggest to the gentleman from New York that there might possibly be some loss to the Government in taking in the old copper bronze pennies and issuing new nickel, one, two and three cent pieces?

MR. POTTER, of New York—I desire to say that the taking in of the old copper pennies has nothing to do with this matter, and I never heard of it.

MR. KELLEY—I have no doubt the gentleman's constituent carefully concealed from him his large interest in it while he plied him with petty plausibilities.

MR. POTTER—The gentleman knows that I have not a bullion dealer in my district. I represent an agricultural district.

MR. KELLEY—We take you as a Representative of the city of New York.

Again, sir, by a mistake in our law it has become impossible to retain an American silver dollar in this country, except in collections of curiosities.

MR. POTTER—I will go hand and with any man who wishes the country to get back to specie payments. But there is only one way in which that can be done. It is to make a dollar of legal tender paper redeemable by, and so equal in actual value, to a real dollar. No contrivance of putting stamps upon these coins or of recoining the coin and putting on another stamp instead of the present one, will make the coin worth one cent more than the real intrinsic value it possesses; and all measures to give a false and arbitrary value to the coin of the country will prove here, as they have proved everywhere, a delusion. And if that is one of the purposes of this bill, it is not a purpose which should commend it to our consideration.

MR. KELLEY—I wish to ask the gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Potter) if he knows of any government in the world which makes its subsidiary coinage of full value? The silver coin of England is 10 per cent. below the value of gold coin, and, acting under the advice of the experts of this country and of England and France; Japan nas made her silver coinage within the last year 12 per cent. below the value of her gold coin, and for this reason: IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO RETAIN THE DOUBLE STANDARD. The values of gold and silver continually fluctuate. You cannot determine this year what will be the relative values of gold and silver next year. They were 15 to 1 a short time ago; they are now 16 to 1.

Hence all experience has shown that you must have ONE STANDARD COIN WHICH SHALL BE A LEGAL TENDER FOR ALL OTHERS, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage of silver, which shall circulate in all parts of the country as a legal tender for a limited amount and be redeemable at its face value by your Government. But, sir, I again and be redeemable at its face value by your Government. But, sir, I again call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentlemen who oppose this bill insist upon maintaining a silver dollar worth 3½ cents more than the gold dollar and worth 7 cents more than two half dollars, and that so long as those provisions remain you cannot keep silver coin in the country.

This bill, while it contains many other excellent provisions, will save to the people of the country at least from a quarter to a half million of dollars in the next year, apart from the jobbery in hypothetical bars, and when we come to specie payments we will save $5,000,000, which now goes to the silver bullion dealers of New York.

(Here the hammer fell.)

The SPEAKER (Mr. James G. Blaine)—Debate on the amendment is exhausted.

On May 27th, 1872, the day the bill passed the House, Mr. Hooper, of Massachusetts, having charge of the bill, said:

"I desire to call up the bill revising and amending the laws relative to mints, assay offices, and coinage of the United States. I do so for the purpose of offering an amendment to the bill in the nature of a substitute, one which have been very carefully prepared and which I have submitted to the different gentlemen in this House who have taken a special interest in the bill. I find that it meets with universal approbation in the form in which I offer it. I move that the rules be suspended and that the substitute be put on its passage."

Mr. Holman, of Indiana, said: "Before the question is taken upon sus-

pending the rules and passing the bill I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will explain the leading changes made by this bill in the existing law, especially in reference to the coinage. It would seem that all the small coinage of the country is intended to be recoined.

MR. HOOPER, of Massachusetts—This bill makes no changes in the existing law in that regard. It does not require the recoinage of the small coins. On the contrary, I understand that the Seretary of the Treasury proposes to issue an order to stop the coinage of all the minor coins, as there is now a great abundance of them in the country.

MR. McCORMICK—What I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Hooper) is, whether, under the provision of the nineteenth section, the Director of the Mint is not authorized to recoin all the nickel coin of the United States in order to make it conform to this section.

MR. HOOPER, of Massachusetts—He is not. On the contrary, under the existing laws, as I stated before, the amount of minor coinage is so large that the Secretary of the Treasury has prepared an order prohibiting any further coinage until further notice.

MR. McCORMICK—I understand that the Director of the Mint says that it costs the Government almost as much to coin a five cent nickel piece as it does to coin a ten-dollar gold piece.

MR. HOOPER, of Massachusetts—There is nothing in this bill to compel a recoinage.

MR. McCORMICK, of Missouri—Would the gentleman have any objection to strike out that section.

MR. HOOPER, of Massachusetts—Certainly I would.

MR. McNEELY—As a member of the Committee on Weights and Measures having carefully read every section and line of this bill, and generally well-understanding the subject before us, I am satisfied the bill ought to pass.

MR. SARGENT—I hope we will now have a vote.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. Hooper, of Massachusetts, to suspend the rules and pass the bill, it was agreed to; there were—ayes 110, nays 13.

This bill, that passed the House, was printed by the Senate May 29th, 1872, in which the silver section as passed by the House, reads:

"Sec. 15. And be it further enacted, That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five cent piece, and a dime or ten cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains; the half-dollar, quarter dollar and dime shall be respectively, one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coin shall be a legal tender, at their denominational value, for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

When you, Mr. Lambert, put on your armor to wage war with your brother editor of the "Post-Express," because he innocently said, "How the Act of 1873 can be considered a crime passes ordinary comprehension," you promised to refute the editor's remarks by "unimpeachable testimony," and your indictment charges—

"That the section of the bill demonetizing silver was surreptitiously altered after it left the hands of the Committee on Coinage and before it ultimately passed the House."

I have proved by the "unimpeachable testimony" of your chief

witness, Mr. Kelley, and other members of the House who took a prominent part in the discussion of the bill, that your indictment has no foundation in fact; that it does not possess a word of truth, and that you, Louis A. Lambert, have been giving the hundred thousand readers of the "Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register," for the last two months, leading editorials consisting of false statements, which you knew were false, thus, I repeat, wilfully maligning the reputation of honorable men, and libeling the living and the dead.

If you were the editor of some silver paper I would not waste time correcting your assertions, but when I consider that the great MacMaster's beloved "Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register" has been debased and dishonored by becoming an advocate of free silver coinage—a financial heresy unequalled—I am compelled by my "moral sense, and justified, nay, bound by the obligation of veracity" I quote your words, to inform the readers of your journal of the deceptions you are practicing upon them by advising them to follow you in voting for the blatant Bryan, whose election would be most detrimental and destructive to the toiling millions of Catholics as well as Protestants who earn their "bread by the sweat of their brow." I do not question your right, sir, to vote as you please, but I do most emphatically question your right, in your dual character of priest and editor of a Catholic journal, to deceive your readers by your editorials, that are filled with fraudulent falsehoods, and vindictive libels.

I learn, by reading your journal of September 5th, that you have changed the location of your indictment, and now charging that "the standard silver dollar was surreptitiously obliterated in the Senate." This tergiversation proves the falseness of your editorials on the silver question, which is the paramount principle in the political campaign that is now waiting the decision of 14,000,000 voters of the United States.

When the editor of the Rochester "Post-Express" failed to convince you that the alleged crime of 1873 was "a downright falsehood," the distinguished editor of the "Philadelphia Times," Mr. McClure, tried his level best to set you right; but, all in vain, for you again assail Mr. McClure's truthful statements by another ponderous editorial of more than two columns, in which you say:

"The sophism of the 'Times' consists in this: It quotes Judge Kelley's words concerning a bill that did not pass, as if they were said of the substitute bill which did pass. This same sophism vitiates the 'Times' article from beginning to end."

If Mr. McClure failed to set you right on the crime of '73, he at least taught you to write Mr. Kelley's name correctly, You have contracted the vicious habit of accusing every editor who has labored to tell you the truth of being guilty of "sophism," which means fallacious argument, that, under certain circumstances, might be pardonable.

But what is it that "vitiates" the "Freeman's Journal's" articles on "The Crime of 1873," written by the Reverend Editor-in-Chief from

the beginning to the end. Malicious falsehoods and vindictive libels. I am repeating what I have already said, for the reason that I challenge Mr. Lambert to accuse me of "sophism." The "Freeman's Journal" contains another sentence quoted from Mr. McClure's editorial, which reads as follows:

The "Times" says: "To charge that a bill that was under consideration from April 25, 1870, to Feb. 7, 1873; that was three times considered in each House; that was discussed for weeks in both branches, and its provisions presented to the public by reports from committees time and time again, was a surreptitious act of legislation, is an utter, absolute falsehood, and an insult to the intelligence of every citizen."

You, Mr. Lambert, reply to this unanswerable conclusion by again dragging in your garbled and mutilated quotation of the speech delivered in the Senate by the Senator of Iowa. You remark:

"Senator Allison considered it in a different light. He said:

'When the secret history of this bill of 1873 comes to be told it will disclose the fact that the House of Representatives intended to coin both gold and silver, and intended to place both metals upon the French relation instead of on our own, which was the true scientific position in reference to this subject in 1873, but that bill was afterward doctored'——

"Here Mr. Sargent interrupted Senator Allison, and asked what he meant by 'doctored.' Allison replied: 'It was changed after discussion, and the dollar of 420 grains was substituted for it.'—Congressional Record, vol. vii, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1058.)

Your first garbling and mutilation of Senator Allison's speech and Senator Sargent's interruption, was contemptible, but your last is "a crime that smells to heaven," and affords me further proof of your insincerity and dishonesty. The word "doctored," like many other words, has a double meaning, and may, or may not, be used offensively. You know what "doctored" whisky means. If a gentleman called at your rectory and you invited him to take some refreshment, and after he had partaken of your hospitality, should thoughtlessly say, "Father Lambert, your whisky has been 'doctored'." You would resent the remark by telling your friend that you never buy adulterated whisky.

I shall give another illustration. I knew you for years as "Father Lambert." I know you now as "Doctor Lambert." Suppose I had met you in Philadelphia when you were Editor-in-Chief of the "Catholic Times" and should have playfully remarked: "Father Lambert, I am pleased to learn that you have been "doctored"," meaning, of course, that the title of "Doctor of Laws" had been conferred on you because of your great learning and distinguished intellectual ability as a Catholic controversialist. You, Reverend Doctor, knowing the double definition of the word "doctored," why did you not quote Senator Allison's explanation of the word? He immediately, and in the sentence you quote, said: "If I must use the term (doctored) I use it in no offensive sense, of course."

Again you say:

"Here Senator Allison lifts a corner of the veil and gives an inkling of the nature of the 'substitute.' It is here that the crime was committed, and all the talk about the bill prior to this time is an attempt to throw dust in the eyes."

I must give you, Reverend Doctor, credit for possessing great perseverance in proving by "unimpeachable testimony" the crime of 1873. You recall to my memory a sentence that I read in the debate which you recommended to the editor of the Philadelphia "Times" for his edification. The sentence reads as follows:

"This persistence in saying that the fall of prices is due to silver is like the story of the grandmother who said there was something good in everything, and the daughter said 'I really believe you would say something good about the prince of evil.' 'Well, my dear, I am sure we must all admit he has great perseverance.'"

You, sir, distinctly state in your editorial, which I have given in full on the first pages of this refutation of your absurd charge that silver was demonetized by the Coinage Act of 1873, you would prove by "unimpeacable testimony" that "The Crime of 1873" was committed "after the bill left the Committee on Coinage and before it passed the House." At that specific time the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains you say, was "surreptitiously obliterated from the document." The Coinage Act of 1873 passed the House on May 27th, 1872. This bill, was reported and printed in the Senate, May 29th, 1872, as it passed the House the silver section reads as follows:

"Sec. 15. That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, a half-dollar or fifty cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five cent piece and a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains; the half-dollar, quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-quarter and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coins shall be a legal tender at their denominational value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

It will be noted that the dollar introduced into the bill, as here shown, contained only 384 grains, exactly the weight of two half-dollars, and like the half-dollars, it had only limited coinage and tender. It was not the old standard dollar of 412½ grains, and did not have free coinage or full tender. This is the dollar which was after-dropped out of the bill, and in place of which the trade dollar of 420 grains, with unlimited coinage but limited tender, as reported and printed in the Senate bill, was substituted December 16th, 1872, as reported, printed, and debated, January 7th, 1873, the silver section reads as follows:

"Sec. 15. That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter dollar or twenty-five cent piece; and the weight of the trade-dollar shall be 420 grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar shall be 12½ grams; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; and said coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

This bill finally passed the Senate January 17th, 1873, and the silver section reads:

"Sec. 15. That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter dollar or twenty-five cent

piece, a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade dollar shall be 420 grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar shall be twelve and one-half grams; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half dollar; and said coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding five dollars in any one payment."

This bill was again ordered printed by the House, January 21st, 1873. A Committee of Conference was appointed by the House, January 25th, and by the Senate January 27th. This committee consisted of Senators Sherman, Scott and Bayard, and Representatives Hooper, Houghton and McNeely. The report of Conference Committee presented and concurred in by the Senate February 6th, and by the House February 7th, and the bill became a law February 12th, 1873, by the approval of President Grant.

I have given your last location of the crime of 1873, where you quote Senator Allison as your witness by mutilating his sentence. I will repeat your assertion as it reads in your editorial published in the "Freeman's Journal," Sept. 5th, '96, which says:

"Here Senator Allison lifts a corner of the veil and gives an inkling of the nature of the 'substitute.' It is here that the crime was committed, and all talk about the bill prior to this time is an attempt to throw dust in the eyes."

It has been impossible for me to read this quotation from your editorial without a feeling of indignation, because it is so unwarrantable and so utterly false, that it does not possess a word of truth. You seem to have forgotten even the motto of the "Freeman's Journal"—"Veritas liberabit vos"—The truth will make you free. I think this quotation could be improved by giving in full the magnificent passage of St. John, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." If people do not know the truth, how can they be free? You, as a Catholic theologian, know what "invincible ignorance" means, and if you were invincibly ignorant of the Coinage Act of 1873, your hope of salvation would not be imperilled, but your editorials for weeks show a very accurate knowledge of that Coinage Act, and you knew the truth as taught by your brother editors—plainly stated in an editoral in the Philadelphia "Times," which you read and from which you quoted in your "Journal" of Sept. 5th, '96. Your turpitude of character is such that I wonder how you can have the unblushing hypocrisy to stand before the altar of God and offer the Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass—the highest act that any priest, bishop or pope can ever perform.

This is a digression, and I return to the question at issue by again repeating your quotation:

"Here Senator Allison lifts a corner of the veil an gives an inkling of the nature of 'substitute.' It is here that the crime was committed, and all talk about the bill prior to this time is an attempt to throw dust in the eyes."

I do not know any man who has taken part in this political campaign that has talked, or written more about the alleged crime of 1873, than L. A. Lambert, you even located the place and time where your imaginary crime was committed, you said distinctly:

"That after the bill left the hands of the Committee on Coinage and before it passed the House the standard silver dollar was surreptitiously obliterated from the document."

Now you conveniently jump from May 27, 1872, when the bill passed the House to January 17, 1873, when the bill passed the Senate. And you, Lambert, "attempt to throw dust in the eyes" of the hundred thousand readers of the "Freeman's Journal," by informing them that

"The Crime of '73 was committed in the Senate by the 'surreptitious obliteration' of the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains and the substitution of a silver dollar of 420 grains."

I cannot possibly understand how this "substitution" can be called a crime. When, some fifty years ago, I first tackled the elementary rules of arithmetic, I am quite certain that I learned that 420 grains of silver were worth more than 412½ grains of the same metal. But what was the "nature of the substitute" of which Senator Allison "gives an inkling," and which you sir, say: "It was here that the crime was committed." What crime, I ask; you answer: "The surreptitious obliteration of the standard silver dollar from the document." I again accuse you of deliberate falsehood. The standard silver dollar weighing 412½ grains was not in the bill printed in the Senate nor in the bill debated in the Senate. During the discussion of the bill, occupying nineteen columns of the "Congressional Globe." Senator Sherman, of the Finance Committee, said: "The trade dollar has been adopted mainly for the benefit of the people of California, and others engaged in trade with China." This was done to enable our merchants to compete with the Mexican dollar which weighs a fraction less than 420 grains. This substitution of the trade dollar was not for "Your FAMILIAR standard dollar," not one of which you ever saw in commercial circulation before your crime of 1873, but was a substitution for the silver dollar weighing 384 grains, and which passed the House May 27, 1872.

There is another sentence in your editorials which I must notice. You say:

"The Chicago convention taught us that the present administration is not an exponent of Democracy; that the true Democracy means bimetallism, and a return to the monetary system established by founders of the Republic in 1792."

Your fling at the President of the United States is not only an insult, but a violation of your theology. When I studied divinity I was taught to pray for "the President of the United States and all others in authority." Your statement "that the present administration is not an exponent of Democracy" is a malicious falsehood, that affords me further evidence of your mendacity. When some future "Bancroft" writes the history of our time and its events, he will place

the name of Grover Cleveland, as the representative of true Democracy, alongside the names of Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson. Again you say that

"The Chicago convention taught you that true Democracy means bimetallism and a return to the monetary system established by the founders of the Republic in 1792."

What do you mean by the word "Bimetallism?" As a classical scholar you know its origin. The "Century Dictionary," now the leading authority on the English language, defines bimetallism as follows:

"Bimetallism pertains to the use of two metals as money at relative values set by legislative enactment; the union of two metals in circulation as money at a fixed rate. Specifically, that system of coinage which recognizes both coins of silver and coins of gold as legal tender to any amount, or the concurrent use of coins of two metals as a circulating medium at a fixed relative value."

This bimetallism the United States has had for the last eighteen years and will maintain, with or without "international agreement." Your bimetallism is the double standard of value in the financial plank of the Chicago convention, which reads thus:

"Recognizing that the money question is paramount to all others at this time, we invite attention to the fact that the constitution names silver and gold together as the money metals of the United States, and that the first coinage law passed by Congress under the constitution made the silver dollar the money unit and admitted gold to free coinage at a ratio based upon the silver dollar unit.

"We declare that the act of 1873, demonetizing silver without the knowledge or approval of the American people, has resulted in the appreciation of gold and a corresponding fall in the prices of commodities produced by the people; a heavy increase in the burden of taxation and of all debts, public and private; the enrichment of the money lending class at home and abroad; the prostration of industry and impoverishment of the people.

"We are unalterably opposed to monometallism, which has locked fast the prosperity of an industrial people in the paralysis of hard times. Gold monometallism is a British policy and its adoption has brought other nations into financial servitude to London. It is not only un-American, but anti-American, and it can be fastened on the United States only by the stifling of that indomitable spirit and love of liberty which proclaimed our political independence in 1776 and won it in the war of the revolution.

"We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. We demand that the standard silver dollar shall be a full legal tender, equally with gold for all debts, public and private, and we favor such legislation as will prevent for the future the demonetization of any kind of legal tender money by private contract."

This financial plank contains a dozen false statements so evidently dishonest that even a school boy who has studied the most elementary book on the financial laws enacted by the Congress of the United States from the beginning to the present time, would be able to prove

the utter falseness of the financial plank adopted by the silvercrats and popocrats at the Chicago convention. The first sentence of this financial plank contains an absolute falsehood, where it says

"That the first coinage law passed by Congress under the constitution made the silver dollar the unit and admitted gold to free coinage at a ratio based upon the silver dollar unit."

The constitution of the United States, Section 8 of Article I., reads:

"THE CONGRESS SHALL HAVE POWER TO COIN MONEY, REGULATE THE VALUE THEREOF, AND OF FOREIGN COINAGE, AND FIX THE STANDARDS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES."

When Mr. Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Jefferson was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Washington, they framed the coinage Act of 1792, and agreed to coin gold and silver at the commercial value of each metal, which they, after long and careful investigation, found to be at the ratio of fifteen ounces of silver for one ounce of gold, and they placed the unit of value on both metals. Mr. Jefferson, when President of the United States in 1805, peremptorily stopped the coinage of silver dollars, and not one was coined for nearly thirty years afterwards. The reason for this action by President Jefferson was that silver at 15 to 1 was undervalued, and silver dollars left the United States as fast as they were coined. The standard silver dollar now in circulation contains the same amount of pure silver as the first silver dollar coined in 1794, and has the same unlimited legal tender now as then. The vast difference being only in their circulation. From 1793 to 1877, a peirod of 85 years the United States mint coined only 8,031,238 standard silver dollars. While from 1878 to 1896, a period of 18 years, our mints coined 429,289,916 standard silver dollars, and there is in the Treasury now silver bullion, enough to coin 200,000,000 silver dollars. Notwithstanding the fact that this enormous amount of silver has been purchased by the Government at the expense of the people, the men who are now masquerading under the honored name of Democracy are shouting for more silver—even the free and unlimited coinage of silver, which if successful would result in the robbery and financial ruin of millions of honest people.

The second sentence contains another downright falsehood where it says:

"We declare that the act of 1873 demonetizing silver without the knowledge or approval of the American people, has resulted in the appreciation of gold."

This declaration is mendacious for two reasons: First, the Act of 1873 did not demonetize silver, and second, that coinage act has not resulted in the appreciation of gold. I know, of course, that the silvercrats are shouting all over the United States about the appreciation of gold, and thundering into the ears of their auditors that a gold dollar containing one hundred cents is now worth two hundred cents.

To illustrate this "sophism" I will take any laborer who sweeps the streets of New York for two dollars a day. This man has a wife and some children who require bread and butter at least. He goes to the store and buys a dollar's worth of groceries, for which he pays a silver dollar. He attends some Tammany Hall meetings and learns all about the two hundred cent dollars, and knowing that two and two make four, he goes to the store the next Saturday night and tells the merchant that he wants to buy two dollars' worth of groceries for a gold dollar, for he heard Senator Grady, of Tammany Hall, tell all the people that gold has so appreciated in value that a gold dollar is worth 200 cents. The merchant's Irishism flashes quickly, and looking his deluded customer in the face, he exclaims: "The next time you see Senator Grady tell him, with my compliments, he is a damn liar." The customer, not entirely satisfied, quietly remarks: "Mr. Bryan said the same thing in Madison Square Hall." The merchant inquires: "Did you hear Mr. Bryan say the same thing?" "No, sir; I went to the hall because I was told the gentleman is a born boy orator, and I am like most Irishmen fond of hearing great orators, but when I saw Mr. Bryan reading his speech I wanted to get out, but there were so many others suddenly seized with the same desire that I found it harder to get out than it was to get in. Talk about orators! Bryan is nowhere when compared with Dennis Kearney. I heard him some years ago when he addressed thousands of people in Union Square and, though only a common drayman, his oratory was worth hearing, no matter what he was saying. While speaking about 'the plumed knight' of Maine or the sand lots of San Francisco his eloquence held his audience spellbound for two hours."

I am apprehensive that you may attack my views on bimetallism and tell your readers that my statements are not correct. Then, sir, you will have also to correct the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin. In his interview with a reporter of the Dublin "Freeman's Journal," which, as I have already stated has been published and circulated by the advocates of the free coinage of silver because it favors, as they think, their views. You, sir, I take it are familiar with this pamphlet. If you will turn to page 15 you will learn what Archbishop Walsh said on bimetallism. I quote his language:

"Bimetallism, as some writers express it, is the monetary system in which the two precious metals, gold and silver, are taken as standards of currency.

"That, however, is a misleading way of putting the case. The word bimetallism indeed is an unfortunate one to have chosen. It gives prominence to the idea of duality, and so leads many half informed people to think that bimetallism, as distinct from monometallism, aims at having two standards of value, instead of one.

"Now this is not at all the case. In the bimetallist system there are not two standards of value; there is but one. One of the essential requirements

of a standard, whether of value, or of length, or of weight, or of anything else, is that it should be one. The word bimetallism, then, as I have said, is, in one respect, an unfortunate one to have been chosen. It gives rise to an unhappy notion that the bimetallists favor some sort of shifting or alternative system of standards. But this is not so. The very opposite is the fact. Unity of standard and stability of standard—in so far as stability in this matter of a standard of value is within the reach of attainment—these are the very fundamental points of bimetallism."

Here the Archbishop plainly states that "many half informed people think that bimetallism aims at having two standards of value instead of one. Now, this is not at all the case. In the bimetallist system there are not two standards of values, there is but one."

Archbishop Walsh positively and truthfully proves that what is called by "many half informed people" a double standard is not really a double standard, but an alternative gold or silver standard. In all nations to-day the standard of value is either gold or silver, but not both in any nation.

Now, Mr. Lambert, I will ask you to look at a few sentences which I quote from the "Congressional Globe" during the debate on the Coinage Act of 1853.

Mr. Skelton, of New Jersey, said among other things that

"Gold is the only standard of value by which all property is now measured; it is virtually the only currency of the country."

And on the same point, Mr. Dunham, who had the measure in charge in the House, said:

"Another objection urged against this proposed change is that it gives us a standard of gold only. * * * What advantage is to be obtained by a standard of the two metals which is not as well, if not much better, attained by a single standard, I am unable to perceive; while there are very great disadvantages resulting from it, as the experience of every nation which has attempted to maintain it has proved. * * * Indeed, it is utterly impossible that you should long at a time maintain a double standard. * * * Gentlemen talk about a double standard of gold and silver as a thing that exists and that we propose to change. We have had but a single standard for the last three or four years. THAT HAS BEEN, AND NOW IS, GOLD. We propose to let it remain so, and to adapt silver to it, to regulate it by it."

But the Act of 1853 did more than this. It reduced the weight of fractional silver coins, making two half dollars to contain only 384 grains of standard silver, and stopped the coinage of fractional silver for private individuals, the Director of the Mint being authorized to purchase the bullion required for such coinage. In 1829, when General Jackson was President, his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Ingham, said: "The proposition that there can be but one standard or measure of value is self-evident." When in 1834 Congress passed a law that

reduced the weight of gold coins and thereby raised the ratio of silver sixteen to one, the Congress hoped that this lessening the value of gold coins would keep silver in circulation. This legislation worked well enough for some years, but we find that Congress in 1849 authorized the coinage of gold dollars because silver dollars had again disappeared, and the Act of 1853 dropped the silver dollar from the list of coins.

The speeches made by members of Congress in 1853 on the coinage question show that the principles of the Act of 1873 had been enunciated twenty years before. The standard silver dollar was "surreptitiously obliterated from the document" the same way as in the Act of 1873.

You are certainly a scholar and a logician and will you kindly inform the readers of your journal how they can "surreptitiously obliterate" from a document something that was never in it. From the time that the Act of 1873 was framed by John Jay Knox, at the request of Secretary Boutwell, to the day that it received the signature of President Grant, the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains was never in the bill at any stage of its discussion, nor was the trade dollar substituted after the bill had passed the Senate. It was in the Senate bill when reported and debated January 7th, 1873, and again we find the trade dollar in the Senate bill when reported, debated and finally passed January 17th, 1873.

Now, sir, I will produce a few living witnesses whose "unimpeachable testimony on your alleged crime of '73" you cannot contradict by your favorite expression of "tricky sophism." Ex-Senator Carl Shurz, in a speech delivered in Chicago, said:

"I was a member of the Senate at the time (1870-3) and know, whereof I affirm; and I emphatically pronounce all the stories about the act of 1873 being passed surreptitiously; about Senators and members being somehow hypnotized, so that they did not know what they were doing; about some Englishman being on the ground with much money to promote the demonetization of silver, and so on, as wholly and unqualifiedly false. I wish to be scrupulously courteous to my opponents, but as a conscientious student of contemporaneous history I am bound to say that in the forty years during which I have been an attentive observer of public affairs I have never witnessed or heard of such unscrupulous, shameless, persistent, audacious, cumulative, gigantic lying as has been and is now done with regard to the act of 1873, its origin, its nature, and its consequences."

The venerable ex-Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, was invited a few weeks ago to address his friends at Berwin, Pennsylvania, and in his speech on that occasion, said:

"Congress perfectly understood what it was about when it passed the revised Coinage Act of 1873. There was no contention about it, although the subject was under consideration for nearly three years. Do the free coinage people, many of the leaders of whom were then and still are, in Congress, pretend that they voted on that act in ignorance of the fact that no provision was made for coining standard silver dollars while express

provision was made for the coinage of small silver, and what was then known as the trade dollar? Did the people misunderstand it? Nobody pretends any such thing. Everbody knew that the commercial countries of the world were, as rapidly as possible coming to the only philosophical standard of values, namely a single standard either of gold or silver. The countries where labor was best awarded, and where the conditions of property and prosperity were the most uniform among all portions of the community, going to the gold standard, while those less happily situated adhered to the silver standard, such as Russia, China, Japan and Mexico."

Do, you, Mr. Lambert, discover any "tricky sophisms" in these quotations? You may say (as you are capable of saying—almost anything) that they are the expressions of men who are opposed to the election of Bryan and Sewel, or Bryan and Watson, for the head of that ticket has two tails, certainly a most unique scheme in our political history.

I shall anticipate your "tricky sophisms" with a few quotations from two prominent senators who are, to-day, advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and strongly in favor of Bryan, without much preference as to Bryan's two tails.

In a debate in the Senate, a year after the alleged Crime of 1873, Senator Jones, of Nevada, on April 1st, 1874, said;

"Does this Congress mean now to leave entirely out of view and discard forever a standard of value? And what but gold can be that standard. What other things on earth possesses the requisite qualities? GOLD IS THE ARTCULATION OF COMMERCE. IT IS THE MOST POTENT AGENT OF CIVILIZATION. IT IS GOLD THAT HAS LIFTED THE NATIONS FROM BARBARISM.

"It is the common denominator of values. It makes possible the classification of labor and the interchange of commodities. Gold has intervened in bargains made between men since the dawn of civilization, and it has never failed to faithfully fulfill its part as the universal agent and servant of mankind. . . . The value of gold is not affected by the stamp of the Government."

The other witness whose "unimpeachable testimony" I shall produce is, not only in favor of Bryan, but the great money power, the most eloquent orator and ablest manager of the free silver party. Senator Stewart, of Nevada, who was senator in 1870, and voted for the Coinage Act of 1873 when it first passed passed the Senate, January 10, 1871, and did not contain a silver dollar of any kind. Before I give Senator Stewart's "unimpeachable testimony," I must notice another sentence in your editorial reply to the editor of the Philadelphia "Times" which reads thus:

"The greater part of the 'Times' article is devoted to a history of the bill from its origin in 1870 to the end of 1872. It is the nature of evidence as to good character up to the latter date. All this may be dismissed as not pertinent to the issue, since the crime charged is held to have been committed subsequent to that period."

If there was no standard silver dollar from its origin in 1870 to the end of 1872, then it is self-evident that the standard

silver dollar was "surreptitiously obliterated from the document" during the period of which you say "the 'Times' article is devoted to a history of the bill and is the nature of evidence as to good character up to the latter date." Your logical mind may be able to form your statement into a syllogism and prove its orrectness But it would look very like the logical reasoning of the notorious Altgeld, whom you admire, and whose speeches you quote. One sentence reads as follows: The distinguished Governor of Illinois says "France has not demonetized silver, she has only closed her mints to the coinage of silver." The United States has demonetized silver. Why? Because they have not closed their mints to the coinage of silver. Allow me to put Altgeld's statement into a syllogism—

Major Premiss—France has not demonetized silver, she has only closed her mints to the coinage of silver. Minor Premiss—The United States have demonetized silver because they have not closed their mints to the coinage of silver. Conclusion—Altgeld is either a fool or a knave.

But I am forgetting to quote the "unimpeachable testimony" of Senator Stewart, of Nevada, who in a debate in the Senate, June 12, 1874, said:

" I want the standard gold and no paper money not redeemable in gold. By this process the Government of the United States will redeem a pledge which it has solemnly made in which its honor is involved. By this process we shall come to a specie basis, and when the laboring man receives a dollar it will have the purchasing power of a dollar; everybody knows what a dollar in gold is worth, the laboring man and the producer is entitled to have his product and his labor measured by the same standard of the world that measures your national debt. . . . Give him such a standard, give him money as you require from him. You require it from the producer. You require from the laboring man gold to pay the interest on your national debt, which is right, which cannot be avoided if you mean to save national honor; but then give him the same money with which to pay that debt. . . .

"THE QUESTION WILL NEVER BE SETTLED UNTIL YOU DETERMINE THE SIMPLE QUESTION WHETHER THE LABORING MAN IS ENTITLED TO HAVE A GOLD DOLLAR IF HE EARNS IT, OR WHETHER YOU ARE GOING TO CHEAT HIM WITH SOMETHING ELSE. THAT IS THE UPSHOT OF THE WHOLE THING. EVERYBODY HAS TO SAY THAT THE LABORING MAN WAS ENTITLED TO A GOOD DOLLAR. THAT WAS FOUGHT OVER. THEY WILL FIGHT IT OVER AGAIN AND THE SAME PARTY WILL WIN. THERE HAVE BEEN A GREAT MANY BATTLES FOUGHT AGAINST GOLD, BUT GOLD HAS WON EVERY TIME. GOLD NEVER HAS COMPROMSED. . . . GOLD HAS MADE THE WORLD RESPECT IT ALL THE TIME."

Here the eloquent Senator Stewart pleads in trumpet tones for the defense of the laboring man who is entitled to have a gold dollar if he earns it, or a dollar that will have the purchasing power of a gold

dollar. This is just where the United States Government stands to-day. The Bland-Allison Act of February 28, 1878, restored the standard silver dollar to the list of coins, and made it unlimited legal tender, and authorized the purchase of from 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 ounces of silver bullion monthly for coinage into silver dollars. The Act of July 14, 1890, amended the Act of February 28, 1878, and directed that silver bullion to the amount of 4,500,000 ounces should be purchased each month, and Treasury notes be issued therefore. When President Cleveland in 1893 called attention to the millions of silver dollars that had been injected into the currency of the United States, and millions of silver ounces piled up in the vaults of the Treasury, he immediately called an extra session of Congress to repeal that portion of the Act of July 14, 1890, directing the purchase of silver bullion. After a long debate, especially in the Senate, during which the panic of '93 occurred, the determined stand of the President refusing to accept any compromise measures, resulted in Congress, repealing on November 1, 1893, the compulsory monthly purchase of silver bullion. Since then the President has preserved the gold standard, and has kept every dollar of our much mixed currency worth a gold dollar, and has made the credit of our Government the equal of any other nation. He has faithfully fulfilled the solem promise contained in the act repealing the silver purchases which reads:

"And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value."

I must call your attention, Mr. Lambert, to another sentence in your "financial plank." It says:

"Gold monometallism is a British policy and its adoption has brought other nations into financial servitude to London."

What an absurdity! What a colossal falsehood! All the civilized nations of the world are on a gold standard and the Chicago political platform tells all these great nations like France and Germany that they are slaves to John Bull. I wonder what Bismarck would say to the fellow that wrote the sentence I have here quoted. But there is a meaning to the words "British policy." The distinguished writer on international law, Mr. I. L. Rice, in an article on the Chicago convention published in the September number of "The Forum," called my attention to this "British policy," and as Mr. Rice is not an Irishman I prefer to quote him rather than use my own words. Mr. Rice says:

The jingo arguments are chiefly addressed to the Irish voter—the bone and sinew of our laboring population. By flaunting the flag marked "British" before his eyes, the hungry politicians expect to enrage him to such an extent that he will forget right and wrong and all dictates of self-interest in the pleasure of a fancied opportunity to twist the tail of the British lion. A most cunning plan this, under the allurement of apparently voting for the

affranchisement of the United States from financial servitude to England, to entice him to vote for his own degradation.

Mr. Bryan and all his followers, including his admiring friend Lambert, are daily repeating that

The crime of '73 which demonetized silver is the one and only cause of the decline in the price of silver bullion."

The price of silver bullion is regulated by the markets of the world, not by the coinage stamp of the United States, and the cause of the decline in silver as in wheat, corn and other products, is simply overproduction, caused largely by improved mechanical inventions and appliances. I will take silver bullion as an illustration. The law of supply and demand is so exacting that writers on the science of Political Economy have been obliged to recognize it. This great commercial law has had its influence on silver as on other commodities. In 1872 the world's production of silver was 61,100,000 ounces; in 1892 the United States production alone was 63,500,000 ounces, and this year I am informed the world's production of silver will amount to 175,000,000 ounces. Is it any wonder that silver has fallen nearly fifty per cent. I will take another illustration, with regard to a metal known as aluminum. Before "the crime of 1873" this metal sold at $95 a pound; it is now sold at 50 cents a pound. What a frightful fall the Act of '73 must have produced on the value of aluminum. Another illustration. In 1843 cotton sold at 5 cents a pound; in 1864 it sold at $1.90 a pound; it is selling to-day at 8 cents a pound in the New York Cotton Exchange. And yet another illustration. Wheat in the "Chicago Board of Trade," the great wheat market of this country, was selling at about $1.00 a bushel in 1873. Since then I have known it to sell in the same "Board of Trade" for $2.00 a bushel; it is now selling at about 70 cents a bushel. For some years back the whole world has been a wheat market, and there is not a month in the year but what has a wheat harvest somewhere. Take corn as an illustration. In 1894 the corn crop in this country was 1,212,770,052 bushels; in 1895 our corn crop increased to $2,151,138,580 bushels. If our poor farmers are loosing money because of the decline in what they produce why do they double their crops as in corn. They remind me of a story I heard about a New York Bowery merchant who sells ready made clothing and assured a customer that he was getting his new suit at a price far below the cost of making it. The customer, somewhat astonished, asked the merchant how he could make any money by selling clothing below cost? The Bowery merchant promptly answered his innocent customer: "I make money by the big business I am doing."

It is well for this country that thinking people do not hesitate to cut loose from party ties when the public good demands that they should do so. There is but one issue before the people to-day, and that is the

maintenance of the honor, the honesty and life of the Republic by sustaining the gold standard. Judge George N. Aldredge describes the situation in the following paragraph:

"To-day the United States, the foremost nation in all the earth in solvency and resources, in intelligence and energy, is seriously invited to abandon the standard of civilization and commerce and to consort with half-civilized, half-clad people, who are weak and ignorant; who have little or no commerce; where bull fights abound and schools do not; where human labor is in sharp competition with the meek and lowly jackass; where a breech-clout is preferred to a full suit, and where the bulk of the people know no more about a standard of value than a mule does about the nebular hypothesis. Surely we would do well to take a look at the company before we sit down to the feast."

Most certainly, judge, and though many of the readers of your graphic language may, like myself, have been life-long Democrats we must vote on the third of next November for the only men who can save us from the degradation which you tersely describe. Every honest citizen of the United States, unless suffering aberation from the free silver coinage craze, must protect himself by voting for McKinley & Hobart. They stand upon a platform pledged to keep every dollar as good as gold, which is now called an "honest dollar, that will not swindle 5,000,000 savings bank depositors to the extent of nearly $900,000,000; an honest dollar that will not defraud the beneficiaries of 9,000,000 to the extent of nearly $2,500,000,000; an honest dollar that will not cheat 3,500,000 members of mutual benefit and assessment societies to the extent of nearly $2,600,000,000; an honest dollar that will not plunder 800,000 shareholders in building and loan associations to the extent of $375,000,000; an honest dollar that will not rob 950,000 Union pensioners to the extent of nearly $70,000,000 per annum; an honest dollar that will not practically double the expenses of the toiling millions of people without correspondingly increasing salaries and wages; an honest dollar that will not enable dishonest debtors to beat their creditors out of about half their dues. This is the sort of an honest dollar for which McKinley stands and to which Bryan is opposed."

I have never had the honor of knowing either Mr. McKinley or Mr. Bryan personally, but I do know their political principles as statesmen. I know that Mr. McKinley led the Republicans of the House to defeat the free coinage amendment inserted by the Senate in the silver purchase act of the Sherman law. In making his closing speech, as reported in the "Congressional Record," June 25th, 1890, Mr. McKinley said:

"Mr. Speaker—It seems to me that the subject now under consideration is grave enough in every aspect to cause us at this, even the last moment of the discussion to pause and thoughtfully consider whether by our votes

here to-day we shall reverse the well-established financial policy of the country. At no time in the history of the United States have gold and silver so circulated side by side in equal volume as gold and silver have circulated concurrently since 1878. Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should preserve these two moneys side by side. And it is because I want to preserve these equal standards of value that I have opposed and shall oppose concurrence in the Senate amendment. I do not want gold at premium. I do not want silver at a discount, but I want both metals side by side, equal in purchasing power, to perform the functions of money with which to do the business and move the commerce of the United States. To tell me that the free and unlimited coinage of the silver of the world, in the absence of co-operation on the part of other commercial nations, will not bring gold to a premium is to deny all history and the weight of all financial experience. The very instant that you have opened up our mints to the silver bullion of the world, independently of international action, that very instant, or in a brief time at best, you have sent gold to a premium, then you have put it in a great measure into disuse and we are remitted to the single standard, that of silver alone. They talk about cheap money. Cheap, as the term has been employed in this debate, is an evidence of financial demoralization and commercial inferiority. Cheap is a badge of degradation, whether it is applied to individuals or whether it is applied to money, and I do not propose by any vote of mine to force the people of the United States, the farmers and the laborers, to the cheapest money of the world, or to any policy which might tend in that direction. Whatever dollars we have in this country must be good dollars, as good in the hands of the poor as the rich; equal in inherent merit; equal in purchasing power, whether they be paper dollars, or gold dollars, or silver dollars, or Treasury notes—each convertible into the other and each exchangeable for the other, because each is based upon equal value and has behind it equal security; good, not by the fiat of law alone, but good because the whole commercial world recognizes its inherent and inextinguishable value. And I stand here to-day speaking not for a single section, but for the whole country, and I say that it is for the highest and best interest of all that whatever money we have it must be based upon both gold and silver and represent the best money in the world."

John Stuart Mill has said: "The voters of the United States have several times, in dealing with financial questions, apparently been about to do the wrong thing, but always at the critical time the great common sense of the people has asserted itself and the wrong thing has been put down and the right thing made to prevail."

When my vindication of the Truth was ready for the press, I read in the New York "Sun" of to-day the following letter, which I consider worthy of the widest circulation:

Philadelphia, Sept. 19, 1896.

Reverend and Dear Sir: We are well aware that the dignity of your sacred office forbids the exercise of your influence in any political matter involving mere questions of executive or legislative policy.

Nevertheless, we are fully persuaded that the questions before the country in the pending Presidential campaign are of an especially serious character because they involve fundamental moral issues. A decision in the selection of a President that will commit the Executive to a policy that in its

application will forcibly compromise private financial obligations and will repudiate a portion of national debts will be a violation of the basic Christian principle that commands honesty between man and man. Such a decision we believe would be thoroughly immoral and would precipitate an ethical and material calamity of incalculable magnitude.

We are also of opinion that the attack now being made upon the regularly constituted legal authorities of the national Government is pernicious and dangerous to an extreme degree; for it contains rebellion against those safeguards of law upon which society, the individual, the several States, and the nation must depend for security and protection. If successful, the vital principles of our Government will be undermined.

Recalling with gratitude the patriotism and eminent public services of the late Most Reverend Archbishop Hughes and many others of the Roman Catholic clergy, when the integrity of our Government was threatened on a former occasion, we take the liberty to suggest that the present is a period of equal danger. The Government is not threatened by physical force, but insidious and false ideas that inspire incipient anarchy and contempt for proper authority are industriously propagated throughout our country.

It is not our purpose to argue the foregoing suggestions. We merely desire to respectfully express the opinion that present political issues involve vital moral questions that powerfully appeal to the religious instructors of the people.

Our committee is not partisan, it includes neither officeholders nor office seekers. We have no personal political interests to serve, being private citizens associated for patriotic purposes. Very respectfully,

ROBERT C. OGDEN,
Chairman Publication Committee.

I sincerely thank you, Mr. Ogden, for your timely letter addressed to Catholic clergymen, with whom I have been intimately associated for the last twenty-five years. I know that they are gentlemen of the highest integrity and nobility of character. I use the word "nobility" in its truest sense. Having travelled through European countries I have always returned home and thanked God that I am a citizen of the United States, where the dignity of man is recognized as the highest order of nobility. There are "black sheep" in every flock, as there was among Christ's chosen Apostles, a Judas who sold his Master for thirty pieces of silver. How many pieces of silver Lambert has received for his political apostacy I do not know, but I am quite certain that long before he ever possessed a standard silver dollar he was familiar with the Latin epigram: **"Prevalebit Veritas."**—"The truth shall prevail."

FRANCIS DILLON-EAGAN.

New York, September 29th, 1896.

31548

END OF
TITLE